Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

03 316 MAY 17 2003

NO.

In The
Supreme Court Of The United States

October Term 2002

ARLIN EDWARD RANEY, Petitioner

vs

UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE, Respondents
Mr. Geo. Steele & Mr. T. Collins, Patent examiners

Counsel for appellant,
United States Attorney for the Dist. Of Columbia,
Mr. Roscoe C. Howard,
Mr. David J. Ball, Jr. Ast. U.S. Attny. of counsel
Judiciary Center, 555 Fourth St. N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20530
(202) 307-0299

On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the District Of Columbia Circuit

SUPPLEMENTAL APPENDIX

Arlin Edward Raney, Pro-se
1020 Old Furnace Rd.
Harrisonburg, Va. 22802
(540) 434-4928

14 pp

SUPPLEMEMTAL INDEX

Page

Statement of the supplemental facts.....1

Order U. S. Ct. of Appeals for the **Federal Circuit**.....s.a-**1**

Order dated March 21, 2003.....s.a-**3**

Mr. Atkins phone request, Raney, submit a supplemental.....

Appendix, Raney erro'neously believed, unpublished, dated ...

3-21-2003 , by, The UNITED STATES COURT of APPEALS....

For THE **DISTRICT of COLUMBIA CIRCUIT**.....s.a-**5**

Note, to Raney, dated 12-26-2002, from The United States ....

Court of Appeals, for the District of Columbia Circuit.....

stating, **Pro-Se, entitled to less restrictive**.....s.a-7

Mr. Atkins, Chief Deputy Clerk request for **second**.....

supplemental appendix.....s. a-**8**

STATEMENT OF THE SUPPLEMENTAL FACT

Raney petitioner had filed three complete " Certiorari " Patent petitions, all Returned by, Ms. Sandra Elliott Spagnolo, AKA, Chief Deputy Clerk, Mr. Jeff Atkins, assistant, point being, prior to Raney filing a "Supplemental Appendix " dated 7-31-2003 , phone requested by Chief deputy clerk, Mr. Atkins on date 7-30-2003 (one day after filed), Raney made two trips to the Supreme Ct., (not to seek legal advice), requesting clerk petition correction where needed. (, Patent petitioner Raney **is dyslex'ic**, as was Mr. Henry Ford, Mr. Albert Einstein, Mr. Winston Churchill,) Raney, a slow interpretive reader, requesting the S. Ct. clerk office to go over Mr. Raney's finished certiorari petition, (page by page) to mark corrections necessary for docketing, Mr. Atkins looked at, explained the orders should be located front, first part, the print should be vertical, excepting the patent drawings, could be

perpendicular. After Raney corrections, Mr. Atkins was called requesting inspection of the corrections, Mr. Atkins explaining, Raney should arrive without appointment, first request Ms. Spagnolo inspection & should Ms. Spagnolo refuse to inspect, Mr. Atkins would !, Mr. Raney, arriving, requested, Ms. Spagnolo inspect the corrected petition, she did, never mentioning, the petition should contain the March 21, 2003, Supp: s.a-3 order herein, and after filing **rejected** Raney, 60 page, forty petition documents, for **the third time** as NOT CONTAINING THE MARCH 21, 2003 Order, Supplemental Appendix s. a-3, herein, (U. S. Ct. of Appeals), Mr. Raney erroneously complained, he never received. Fact is, This transfer order, **precipitated** , Raney Supreme Court patent appeal, see Supplemental Appendix s. a-1 order from the USA Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, as Raney had suffered 4, USA Dist. Ct.

Appeals, 3, (PTO) Patent & Trademark patent appeals, seven appeals, The forth appeal, the RBW court finally taking action, issuing a " Mandamus show cause order " the PTO failed to timely answer, the RBW court setting the action for jury trial, holding the action for nine months & on the 18th. day cancelled the 20th. preliminary trial day hearing with order to dismiss Mandamus. Raney immediately appealed to the United States Court of Appeals, for The Dist. of Columbia Circuit, see: Supplemental Appendix s. a-5 herein, see appendix a-12 & a-9, PTO , request to transfer patent petition to a 8th appeal, being the fifth Federal Court, where Raney, upon order notice, **Obvious to Raney** , lost patients, immediately filed appeal to the Supreme Court, " APPEALING THE RBW MANDAMUS ORDER " contrary to Article 1, sec. 8, clause 8, citizen constitution guarantee, Not a transfer from one court to another, " FURTHER " if four US District courts claiming the US District court for the District of Columbia all determined that court had jurisdiction & the RBW court

holding the action for trial, certainly indicates, if these courts are in jurisdiction error, then Raney petitioner is entitled as is the other 300 million USA citizens, entitled to have a US Supreme Court , Constitution Determination.,

Respectfully submitted this 22nd. Day of August, 2003, 2 days after Mr. Atkins second supplemental appendix request.

_____signed_____
Arlin Edward Raney, petitioner
1020 Old Furnace Rd.
Harrisonburg, Virginia 22802
(540) 434-4928

NOTE: Pursuant to Fed. Cir. R. 47.6, this order is
Not citable as precedent. It is a public order

United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit
03-1332

ARLIN EDWARD RANEY
Plaintiff –Appellant.

v.

UNITED STATES,
JANES E. ROGAN, Director, Patent and Trademark Office
GEORGE L. STEELE, Patent examiner,
And TIMOTHY D. COLLINS,
appeal Patent Application Examiner
Defendants-Appellees.

ON MOTION

Befor RADER, GAJARSA, and LINN, Circuit Judges.

RADER, Circuit Judge.

ORDER

We treat the documents filed by Arlin E. Raney as a motion to voluntarily dismiss his appeal which was docketed by this court.

This appeal is one transferred by the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. In the documents,

Raney states, " I am sorry do not docked this what ever it is....I am Appealing to the Supreme Court Ct. of USA" On an informal brief form, Raney indicates that he does not wish to file a brief in this court.

Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED THAT:

(1) Raney's motion is granted and this appeal is dismissed.

(2) Each side shall bear its own costs.

FOR THE COURT

7-30-03
Date

SIGNED
Randall R. Rader
Circuit Judge

S8

ISSUED AS A MANDATE: JULY 31,2003

Filed
US Court of Appeals for the
Federal Circuit JUL 31 2003
JAN HORBALY
CLERK

United States Court of Appeals

For The District of Columbia Circuit

NO. 02-5409 **September Term, 2002**

Arlin E. Raney,
Appellant

v.

United States of America, et al.
Appellees

Filed On:
March 21, 2003
Clerk

BEFORE: Ginsburg, Chief Judge, and Randolph and Rodgers Circuit Judges

ORDER

Upon consideration of the motion to transfer and the response thereto,

It is

ORDERED that the transfer be granted. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. & 1295 The Federal Circuit has exclusive jurisdiction over appeals arising under 28 U.S.C. Sec. 1338 which grants jurisdiction over cases " relating to patents "

The Clerk is directed to transmit the original file and certified copy of this order

To the United States Court for the Federal Circuit.

PER CURIAM

Initialed

DG.
MER
JWR

SUPPLEMENTAL APPENDIX s.a-1

Certiorari Petitioner Raney was requested on date 7-30-03 to make a " Supplemental Appendix " addition of a alleged " UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT [No. 02-5409 (C.A. No. 02-431), [ORDER_DATED 3-21-03] .

No Order Existed, by that court or any court of appeals except (RBW) CA No.02-0431order as appealed to that court dated 3-18-02, as Certiorari submitted on appendix page a-1, to wit:

The S. Ct. Forum is requested to review Appendix a-1, (RBW) CA 02-0431order, filed dated March 18, 2002 **(Show Cause Order)** and the (RBW) COLATERAL JUDGEMENT ORDER, filed on date November 18, 2002 as copied at Appendix a-7 & a-8, with (RBW) order, **"Memorandum"** dated Nov. 18, 2003 in between, four pages, a-7 $^{1/8}$, a-7 ^{½} , a-7 $^{5/8}$, a-7 ^{¼} . Appealed to The

Supreme Court Raney requested " CERTIORARI " as a article **1**, Section **8**, Clause **8**, USA Constitution [**Grievance**].

For reasons Raney noted to the United States Court of Appeals for The District of Columbia, **Appendix (C) a-12**, regarding The Patent & Trademark Office (PTO), **Appendix, (B) a-9**, belated request to transfer The United States Court of Appeals for The District of Columbia , **" APPEAL "** for the 7th. time to a court of appeals for the Federal Circuit.

Respectfully supplemental appendix submitted,

7-31-2003

_____signed_____

Arlin E. Raney, Petitioner
1020 Old Furnace Rd.
Harrisonburg, Virginia 22802
(540) 434-4928

UNIED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

.....

NO. 02-5409

September Term, 2002
Dist. Ct. No. 02cv00431
File 12-26-2002
CLERK

N O T I C E

Decisions of The Supreme Court of The United States and of this Court have held that individuals representing themselves who are not Attorney are entitled to have their pleadings viewed in a less restrictive manner than pleadings submitted by attorneys

Notice Pro-se (August 1996)

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20543-0001

Arlin Edward Raney

RE: Raney v. U.S. Patent & Trademark Office

Dear Mr. Raney:

The above-entitled petition for a writ of certiorari was originally postmarked May 17, 2003 & received again on Aug. 5, 2003. The supplemental appendix you have submitted is herewith returned.

The supplemental appendix does not contain the March 21, 2003 order of the United States Court of Appeals for the Dist. of Col. No 02-5409. Kindly correct the supplemental appendix so that it complies with the rules of this court & return it to this office promptly so that the petition may be docketed. Rule 14.1 (i) (i).

Please note that the May 28, 2003 correspondence states that the corrected petition must be receive by this office within 60 days of the date of the letter , or the petition will not be filed, rule 14.5.

Sincerely, W. K. Sutter, Clerk by: Jeffrey Atkins, Signed